

# MCH Training Program 2006-2007 Strategic Planning Workgroups

## Reporting and Monitoring Teleconference

July 25, 2006

### Meeting Notes

#### Introductions

- **MCH Training Resource Center:** Sheryl Mathis, Judy Gallagher, Anita Farel introduced themselves as Resource Center staff. Judy Gallagher will be the Resource Center liaison for the Reporting and Monitoring Care Workgroup. The role of the Resource Center liaison will be to facilitate workgroup calls and meetings, coordinate communication between workgroup members and the 4 workgroups. The facilitator will also act as resource a person to assist with identifying and/or compiling background materials needed by the group to move forward with specific tasks and coordinate activities of this workgroup with the work of the other groups.
- **MCHB Project Officer and Workgroup Liaison:** The role of the MCHB liaison will be to provide guidance as needed on MCHB priorities and workgroup activities as well as providing a MCH Training Program context for issues addressed by the workgroup. Laura Kavanagh will act as the MCHB liaison for the workgroup. She introduced herself and described her high level of interest in the work of the group.
- **Workgroup Members Present:** Shirley Robinson Hankins, Anne Turner-Henson, John Ehiri, Mary Ott, Arnold Birenbaum, Connie Wiemann, and Cheryl Shaul. Several other members of the workgroup were unable to participate in this call due to vacations and other previous commitments.

#### Workgroup Purpose/Mandate and Proposed Activities

Facilitators reviewed the purpose of the workgroup and proposed activities as stated in the *Priority MCH Training Workgroups 2006-2007* document. The purpose of this document was to illustrate the role of grantee workgroups in promoting the Strategic Plan and to identify potential partners who could provide additional support or resources to the work of the groups.

The focus of this workgroup is primarily on Strategic Plan goals 1, 2, 4 and 5. A question was Workgroup participants asked for clarification about goal 1, objective 7; the objective refers to graduates working in underserved communities, while the proposed workgroup activities focus on training individuals from underserved communities. Laura Kavanagh clarified that when the Training Program staff discussed this objective in relation to workgroup activities a decision was made to expand the focus of the objective to look both at the extent to which the training program provides trainees who work in underserved communities and the extent to which people from underserved communities are trained through the program. Therefore it is important to have a means to measure: 1) the extent to which training programs provide trainees who work in underserved communities; and 2) the extent to which people from underserved communities are trained through the program.

## Desired Outcomes for the Workgroup and Priority Activities

The focus of the Reporting and Monitoring Workgroup is on creating strategies and identifying measures to assess MCH Training Program processes and outcomes. These can then be used by grantees to document their efforts and successes and to “tell the MCH Training Story.”

Workgroup participants asked which goals and objectives the Bureau would identify as priorities for work on measurement. She identified Goal 5- objective 8 (providing evidence that MCH Training Programs have translated research into policy, practice, or training) and stated that people outside of the program tend to measure training outcomes by the number trainees supported. However it is also important to consider other outcomes that result in changes in policies or performance (e.g. the extent to which supported faculty’s research facilitates new policies and practices). These types of result-oriented outcomes are not currently monitored by the measures we have such as identifying the number of publications developed within a specific training program. Workgroup members discussed what could be considered examples of research translated to policy, practice and training. Examples mentioned were research that has been adapted for classroom use, included in curricula, or informed policy change; and a journal article that becomes required reading for a training course.

In focusing on outcome measures, Laura reminded the group of the importance of striking a balance between gathering enough information to be useful but not so much that it is unduly burdensome.

Other priorities identified by Laura of particular concern to the MCHB are goal 1-objective 7, goal 4-objective 2 and goal 5-objective 6. There was some discussion to clarify that goal 5-objective 6 focuses on research to assess the *effectiveness* of interdisciplinary practice not increasing interdisciplinary research. Again, the focus of the workgroup is on the identification of how we know and can document the effectiveness of interdisciplinary practice.

In discussing priority areas for monitoring and reporting, participants focused on the following areas:

- Need for more specificity about which types of trainees (short term, medium term or long term) are being targeted for specific strategic plan objectives. It was noted that long term trainees have been the primary focus of reporting and monitoring, accountability efforts to date and the expectations for short and medium term training programs has not been explored as much.
- To what extent do current faculty and trainees represent underserved communities? Summary data on the race and ethnicity of current faculty and trainees is available from the 2005 continuation applications and that information can be shared with the workgroup.
- It was suggested that Goal 2 – objectives 3 and 6 present issues that are intertwined. These two objectives may need to be combined and addressed as one issue.

- Goal 4 – objective 2 (graduates demonstrating field leadership 5-years after graduation): Should the reporting requirement for this measure include more descriptive information about how trainees are demonstrating field leadership? The Training Program would like to know more about what type of information would be helpful for grantees to know about their former trainees. Development of a toolbox on how to track graduates was suggested. It was noted that it is very challenging to track intermediate trainees over a 5-year period.

The key monitoring and reporting priorities agreed upon by the group were:

- Goal 1 – objective 7: (as expanded in discussion to include) Increasing proportion of trainees from underserved communities – Workgroup task: how to monitor and report on progress and the nature of the progress?
- Goal 5 – objective 6: Increasing research projects that address the effectiveness of MCH interdisciplinary training. Workgroup task: How to monitor and report on the effectiveness of interdisciplinary training?
- Goal 5 – objective 8: Increasing evidence MCH training projects have translated research into policy, practice or training. Workgroup Task: How to monitor and report on progress and outcomes for the translation of research into policy, practice or training?

## Drafting a Workplan

HSR will develop a draft workplan based on the priority activities identified by the workgroup members during the conference call discussion and input provided by members who were not able to make the call.

## Next Steps

- Notes from today's conference and the draft plan will be circulated to the group for review and comment.
- The next workgroup call will take place on Tuesday August 15 at 1pm Eastern time. Instructions for accessing the call will be emailed to the group.
- The agenda for the next call is to obtain feedback and finalize the draft work plan, and to discuss timeline and persons responsible for taking the lead on specific tasks.